REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to correct an informality. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. Personal Interview

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Le and Primary Examiner Bui during the interview held on January 13, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

II. Claim Objection

Claim 1 is objected to for informality. As the claim is amended in response to the objection, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by "Creating Electronic Documents That Interact With The Diagnostic Software For On-Site Service", Harmison, IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, Vol. 40, No. 2, June 1997 (Harmison). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. The elements must be arranged as required by the claim but complete identity of terminology is not required. (See MPEP §2131).

Harmison fails to disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims. Harmison discloses an electronic documentation system that lets users access large technical documents that include text, graphics, video and sound. The documents interact with the equipment being serviced to provide the reader with information relative to the current situation

(Abstract of Harmison). The document management system of Harmison was created to provide field service engineers with the information they need when they need it (page 92, col. 2.) The electronic documentation system was implemented through a browser which allowed documents of different document-type definitions to be accessed and viewed by the service engineers.

The browser includes plug-in modules that can communicate with a copier or printer being serviced (page 94, col. 1, paragraph 3-col. 2, paragraph 1). Some of the information accessible through the browser is documentation relating to a machine's configuration. The system is able to display those parts of a document which are relevant to the configuration being serviced either through manual (user input) or automatic (direct connection) means (page 94, col. 2, paragraph 2). Thus, Harmison discloses that the browser is able to identify the current configuration of a device to be serviced by an engineer.

Harmison further discloses that the browser enables documents to access data from the machine being serviced to obtain stored data about the current and past state of the machine that is useful in helping diagnose or repair the machine (page 99, col. 2, paragraph 3). For example, when a service engineer is attempting to diagnose a problem, the documentation of a service manual may suggest checking the copy count since the last service date. In some machines, the copy count may be stored in the machine being serviced and is obtainable by the service engineer. The browser of the electronic document system allows this information to be integrated into a document through a plug-in module of the browser which knows how to access the data on the machine (page 99, col. 1, paragraph 1). Thus, the browser will allow a piece of information that may be helpful or required in diagnosing a problem in the machine being serviced to be integrated into a field in a document to allow the browser to then access the proper information in the service manual document so the service engineer can more readily attempt to resolve the problem.

Thus, although Harmison discloses obtaining a current configuration of a machine to be serviced, as well as the ability of the browser to obtain a particular data entry relating to current and past states of the machine, Harmison fails to disclose generating a configuration log for a modular device that includes entries indicating an identity of a module and at least one of introduction or removal of a module relative to the device. Rather, Harmison merely discloses that a service engineer can obtain the current configuration of the device being serviced and not the ability to determine whether a module has been exchanged in that device.

Additionally, Harmison fails to disclose merging an event and configuration log to create an integrated log. Rather, Harmison merely discloses separately obtaining the current configuration of a machine to be serviced and possibly obtaining current and past states of a machine. Harmison fails to disclose merging such data into an integrated log. Furthermore, Harmison fails to delineate entries in the integrated log according to a selected configuration and presenting the delineated entries to uniquely identify the entries corresponding to this selected configuration.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action alleges that Harmison discloses at three different places in the document, generating a configuration log for the modular device that includes entries indicating an identity of a module and at least one of introduction and removal of modules relative to the device. For example, the Office Action alleges that Harmison discloses this feature at page 93, in the second column, third paragraph. However, the cited section merely relates to the description of documents that Xerox typically produces as service manuals. The Office Action also alleges that this feature is disclosed at page 94, second column, second paragraph. The cited section of Harmison describes the browser and that "the system can determine the configuration being serviced through either manual (user input) or automatic (direct connection) means. As discussed above, this section merely indicates that the current configuration of a machine being serviced may be determined. Finally, the Office Action

alleges that this feature is also disclosed at page 97 in examples 1-3. However, the examples at page 97 describe the "text layer" which Xerox uses to overlay on top of graphics. Such a text layer can be translated to a foreign language without touching the base illustration, can be edited by a manual writer at the last minute rather than revising the illustration, and allows the base illustration to be used in several places in the document with different text overlaying it. The text layer allows searching on the text layer to identify and locate the underlying graphic which could not previously be done when the graphic was in a bit map configuration. Thus, the three examples provided on page 97 do not relate in any way to the generation of a configuration log and identifying at least one of introduction removal of a module in a multi-modular device.

For example, in Example 1 showing Text on the Graphic, a "hot spot" or hyperlink is placed on an instruction of "remove the roller by pulling up and back" to allow the service engineer to click on the hyperlink to find the graphic showing how to remove a roller for service. Such an example does not correspond to generating a configuration log as recited in the rejected claim. Example 2 on page 97 is an example of a Graphic to Text Link in which the text "ADJ 9.3" is overlaid on a graphic. When the service engineer clicks on the text, a hyperlink executes whatever behavior is associated with the link element, such as displaying the text of the Adjustment procedure 9.3. Example 3 provides a Text to Graphic Link example showing a hyperlink to take the service engineer to a parts list to determine the part associated with a number displayed on the document. Accordingly, none of the examples provided to support the allegation that the feature of claim 1 is disclosed in Harmison or relate in any way to such a feature.

The Office Action further alleges that Harmison shows the feature of merging the event and configuration logs to create an integrated log, at page 97, Examples 1-3. For the reasons discussed above regarding Examples 1-3 shown on page 97, this feature is not shown in Harmison.

Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that Harmison discloses delineating entries in the integrated log according to a selected configuration, and presenting the delineated entries to uniquely identify the entries corresponding to the selected configuration, at page 98 in the second column, paragraphs 2-4, as well as in col. 1, paragraphs 1-3. At page 98, Harmison describes the forms which were created in the electronic document management system to allow the service engineer to more easily access the proper section of the service manual when servicing a device in the field. In the forms, a series of checkboxes were created by the author of the form who wrote the installation or service procedure to expedite access to such information. The checkboxes are designed to deal with a multiplicity of device configurations. For example, a printer may have three separate network interface options. By checking the network interface option which is implemented in that printer, only the text for the procedure pertaining to that particular network interface will be shown and the text for the remaining two interface options will not be shown (see page 98, cols. 1-3 of Harmison). Thus, Harmison fails to disclose the feature as recited in claim 1.

Regarding the additional rejected claims, as Harmison fails to disclose the features recited therein, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-15 is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John W. Fitzpatrick
Registration No. 41,018

JAO:JWF/ldg

Date: January 25, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037